

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/693,908	10/23/2000		Paul L. Hermonat	023533/0130	8355
22428	7590	04/21/2004		EXAMINER	
FOLEY AN	ID LARI	ONER		CHISM, E	BILLY D
SUITE 500 3000 K STR	EET NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGT			1654		
				DATE MAILED 04/21/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/693,908	HERMONAT, PAUL L.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		B. Dell Chism	1654				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
THE - External control	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_·					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 2,4-20 and 46 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 2, 4-20 and 46 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction to oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) [a) [Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive n (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage				
Attachmen	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1654

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to Applicant's paper filed 21 January 2004. Applicant's have been fully considered but they are persuasive in part and not persuasive in part. Claims 2, 4-20 and 46 are pending and under consideration.

Withdrawal of Objections and Rejections

The rejections and/or objections made in the prior office action, dated 21 October 2003, which are not explicitly stated below, in original or modified form are withdrawn.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. Applicants' arguments filed will be addressed to the extent that they pertain to the present grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. (Maintained) Claim 20 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for in vitro administration of the AAV Rep78 mutant for replication studies, does not reasonably provide enablement for in vivo therapeutic uses. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The examiner acknowledges Applicant's arguments, however, they are not persuasive for the reasons stated in the previous office action. Again, there are no working examples or guidance that would lead one of ordinary skill to overcome the unpredictability taught in the art regarding therapeutic efficacy of viral vectors administered in vivo. The specification and arguments are all based on in vitro studies, and present no in vivo working example or guidance.

Art Unit: 1654

Applicant poses several arguments that AAV is predictable, however, there is no disclosure as to the predictability of the AAV Rep78 mutant that is claimed. Thus, the rejection is maintained.

2. (Maintained) Claims 2, 4-20 and 46 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an AAV Rep78 mutant that demonstrates enhanced binding to HPV16 and decreasing binding to itself, does not reasonably provide enablement for increased or decreased binding to HIV and oncogenes as compared with wild type. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The rejection is to the mutant and the lack of disclosure demonstrating that the mutant increases or decreases binding to HIV and oncogenes as compared with wild type. Applicant cites the disclosure at page 5, beginning at line 5, however, this merely states what known characteristics of the wild type. The examiner acknowledges that the disclosed references to the wild type cited on page 5 and its characteristics, however, this does not offer any guidance, predictability or working examples regarding the making or using of the mutant for the claimed increased or decreased binding to HIV and oncogenes as compared with the wild type. The mere ability to mutate the wild type does not convey mutant activity that increases or decreases binding to HIV and oncogenes as compared with the wild type. This line of claimed enablement imposes and undue experimental burden on one of ordinary skill to arbitrarily pick and choose mutations from the myriad of possibilities until the desired characteristics are acquired. Thus, the rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 1654

3. (Maintained) Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The Applicant's arguments are well taken, however, they have not obviated the rejection. It should be noted that the disclosure of the entire DNA sequence does not capitulate the virus mutants claimed. Thus, the requirement for disclosure is maintained as stated in the previous two office actions. Applicant must provide a statement regarding public knowledge and that the claimed virus mutants will be publicly available for the life of the patent (see MPEP§ 2402-2403 and 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 for all requirements for deposit).

It should be noted that due to examiner error in the previous office actions, claim 12 was excluded from the rejection as applied to claim 11, however, the essence of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 does not change and the rejection maintains the same claim language and does not constitute a new grounds for rejection.

4. (Withdrawn) Rejections of claims 7, 14-15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention are withdrawn.

Conclusion

5. No claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1654

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to B. Dell Chism whose telephone number is 571-272-0962. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:30 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 571-272-0961. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

B. Dell Chism

19 April 2004

CHRISTOPHER R. TATE
PRIMARY EXAMINER